REMARKS

Claims 10, 11, 13, 14, 16-21, and 23-34 are pending in this application, of which claims 10, 20, 24, and 34 are independent. Favorable reconsideration is requested in view of the foregoing amendments and the following remarks.

Claims 10, 11, 13, 14, 16-21, and 23-34 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being unpatentable over USPN 6,185,625 issued to Tso et al. (hereinafter Tso) in view of USPN 6,594,682 issued to Peterson et al. (hereinafter Peterson).

Claim 10, as previously-presented, recites a data server that includes "a channel generator for gathering a plurality of contents having a predetermined subject, provided by the web servers, and ***binding the contents into a single channel of contents***."

The examiner acknowledges that Tso does not teach a channel generator and relies on Peterson for such teaching. In the previously-filed Reply, the applicant argued that in Peterson, content is filtered at the client and not at a server. In rejecting the applicant's argument, the examiner asserted that

> "... it is well known in the art that a client can be a server and vice versa. Also, the recitation "a data server" has not been given patentable weight because the recitation occurs in the preamble." (page 17, final office action).

While it may be true that in some cases "a client can be a server and vice versa", the applicant respectfully submits that such is not the case where the Peterson system is concerned as the client and servers of Peterson operate in a fundamentally different manner from that of the applicant's system. For the purpose of advancing prosecution, the applicant has amended claim 10 to make clear that the ***data server*** "[gathers] a plurality of contents having a predetermined subject ... and [binds] the contents into a single channel of contents ***prior to transmission of the single channel of contents to the portable terminal***."

The applicant submits that no component of the Peterson system teaches such a feature. If anything, Peterson teaches away from such a feature as, in one embodiment, the client obtains Web content from servers in a category agnostic manner. (col. 8, lines 63-67; col. 9, lines 18-20). That is, Web content of any and all categories are obtained by the client and stored in its

cache. The client also retrieves, with the Web content, an index that contains descriptive information about the Web content that can subsequently be used by an indexing subsystem to categorize the Web content. (col. 6, lines 22-26). Specifically, the indexing subsystem retrieves the index from the cache and presents the index to a user through a user interface (e.g., the user interface of FIG. 5). (col. 9, line 65 – col. 10, line 1). The index lists the available Web content that is stored in the cache by category. (col. 10, lines 1-2). The user can interact with the user interface to select one or more categories of Web content. (col. 10, lines 9-16). The indexing subsystem stores the user's category preferences and a browser of the client uses the stored category preferences to filter the Web content in the cache. (col. 10, lines 17-50). Only the Web content that survives the filtering process is presented in a content view user interface. (col. 10, lines 51-52).

What is important to note from Peterson is that any binding of Web content into a channel occurs ***at the client after the Web contents are retrieved from the servers***. Peterson does not disclose or suggest a data server that includes "a channel generator for gathering a plurality of contents having a predetermined subject ... and binding the contents into a single channel of contents ***prior to transmission of the single channel of contents to the portable terminal***" as recited in amended claim 10.

Furthermore, in other embodiments of Peterson, although the user selects the categories of Web content to be retrieved from the servers (see col. 14, lines 26-53), Peterson is silent about whether any one of the servers from which the client retrieves the Web content includes "a channel generator for ... binding the contents into a single channel of contents prior to transmission of the single channel of contents to the portable terminal" as recited in amended claim 10. At most, it appears from FIG. 9 of Peterson that the client retrieves the Web content directly from the various Web sites independent of each other and without any processing occurring prior to the transmission of the Web contents to the client.

Claim 10, as amended, further recites a data server having a proxy unit that "checks whether a uniform resource locator (URL) input by the portable terminal is ***a channel URL that is of a set of URLs*** of a plurality of the web servers that provide the contents of a predetermined

subject, and when the URL input by the portable terminal is a channel URL, the proxy unit calls the channel generator."

The applicant respectfully submits that no component of the Tso system or the Peterson system teaches such a feature. At most, Peterson discloses providing a browser through which the user constructs custom or personal channels by aggregating content from multiple channels into a single custom channel. (col. 8, lines 43-54, col. 11, lines 48-50). However, the custom channel of Peterson is not the same as the "channel URL" of claim 10. Rather, each custom channel of Peterson is associated with a set of filtration rules that are based on a user's selections and preferences. As Peterson states:

> **The user selects a set of channels from the channel pane 122 and indicates the preferred Web content within each channel. The browser takes the user's input and constructs a set of filtration rules based on the user's selections and preferences. The browser then creates a new channel that presents the Web content from the set of channels that survives the filters. (col. 11, lines 50-56; emphasis added)**

Subsequently, when the user clicks on a particular channel displayed in a channel pane UI of the client, the browser at the client inputs ***multiple URLs*** in order to retrieve corresponding Web content from the respective Web servers, filters the retrieved Web content using the set of filtration rules associated with the channel, and provides only the Web content that survives the filtration rules in a viewer UI of the client. (col. 11, line 57 – col. 12, line 15). By contrast, the server of claim 10 interfaces with a portable terminal that inputs a ***single URL***, which then has to be checked by a proxy unit of the server to determine whether the single URL "is ***a channel URL that is of a set of URLs*** of a plurality of the web servers that provide the contents ***of a predetermined subject***" in order to effect a calling of a channel generator.

For at least these reasons, the applicant respectfully submits that claim 10 and its dependents are in condition for allowance.

The foregoing remarks also apply to independent claims 20, 24, and 34, which have corresponding limitations, and the claims that depend, directly and indirectly from, claims 20, 24, and 34.

It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or

concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment.

Enclosed is a $225.00 check for the Petition for Extension of Time fee. Please apply any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 12/1/05

Mandy Jubang
Reg. No. 45,884

Fish & Richardson P.C.
225 Franklin Street
Boston, MA 02110
Telephone: (617) 542-5070
Facsimile: (617) 542-8906